

A STUDY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF
SELF-GOVERNMENT IN A CLUB GROUP

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

BY

THEODORE LOVEJOY CARTEN

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

MAY 1960

R = iv TP = 79

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation and indebtedness to Mr. Carl S. Harm professor of Social Work, Atlanta University School of Social Work, for his assistance and guidance in gathering, interpreting, and preparing the data materials for this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Significance of the Study	1
Purposes of the Study	5
Method of Procedure	5
Scope and Limitations	6
II. AGENCY SETTING	7
III. SURVEY OF PERTINENT LITERATURE	10
Theoretical Frame of Reference	13
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA	19
Tabulation	19
Making Majority Decisions: Showing the Tabulations of Constructed Characteristics A, B, C, and D	21
Formulation of Plans: Showing the Tabulations of Constructed Characteristics A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H	24
Equal Participation (Atmosphere): Showing the Tabulations of Constructed Characteristics A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I	28
Self-Imposed Group Controls: Showing the Tabulation of Constructed Characteristics A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, and L	32
Execution of Proposed Plans: Showing the Tabulation of Constructed Characteristics A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, and J	36
Evaluation: Showing the Tabulations of Constructed Characteristics A, B, C, D, and E	40
Interpretation	43
Conclusion	54
V. SUMMARY	56
APPENDICES	58
A. Excerpts	59
B. Research Schedule	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Making Majority Decisions	21
2. Formulation of Plans	24
3. Equal Participation (Atmosphere)	28
4. Self Imposed Group Controls	32
5. Execution of Proposed Plans	36
6. Evaluation	40

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Significance of the Study

In a democracy, such as ours, the people play an important part in conducting government affairs. The early group workers recognized this and encouraged the development of self-government within the groups with which they worked. As Collins states:

One of the fundamental ideas of the founders of the group work movement was that the small group should be used to provide training in citizenship and government. Here, in miniature, was the whole structure of democracy; here young people might learn how the machinery of government functions, and how to make a place for themselves in it.¹

It can readily be seen that one of the most important aspects of group life consists of the development of self-government. As Trecker says:

The decision-making process in group life is the most powerful of several dynamics. When the members have a voice in making the decisions of the group, they are involved in a most significant way. When they do not have such a voice, their degree of involvement is likely to be slight, and the group has less meaning and little influence over their behavior.²

It can further be seen that social group work requires that the worker play an important part in facilitating this development by using his knowledge and skills. Even though, through the normal group process without a social group worker, some form of self-government develops (cooperative

¹Alice H. Collins, Methods in Group Work (New York, 1938), p. 44.

²Harleigh B. Trecker, Social Group Work (New York, 1955), p. 80.

effort is essential to any group before they can expect to attain their goals), the worker enables the group to develop its self-government in the most effective and democratic way. This is supported by Trecker who states:

The development of responsible behavior on the part of group members is one of the goals of group work. We hope that through guided group experiences we shall be able to help individuals have responsibility toward their group, their agency, and their community. In addition, we hope that we shall develop group controls and group behavior that reflect mature responsibility.¹

...The group worker wants the group to become as self-directing and self-governing as possible. He wants the control of the group to rest in the hands of the members.²

Wilson and Ryland seem to concur with Trecker in the opinion that the decision-making process is the most important function in group life because it is through this medium that the group learns to accept controls:

The decision-making process is the central core of the social group work method, and it is essential that the structure be such that the members have the privileges and responsibilities of the management of their own corporate affairs. A collection of individuals will not develop the characteristics of a social group unless they have the right and ability to make decisions significant to their own group life. Nor will they grow and develop unless they experience the discipline which comes from the adjustment of personal claims to the claims of the group-as-a-whole. ...The worker's aim is to help the members of the group develop the capacity to carry out their own group life, make their own decisions and carry them out.³

Trecker goes on to say that the objective of group work is the development of group self-discipline rather than the controls placed on the group

¹Ibid., p. 191

²Harleigh B. Trecker, Social Group Work (New York, 1948), p. 21.

³Gertrude Wilson and Gladys Ryland, Social Group Work Practice (Boston, 1949), pp. 66-67.

by outside forces. Also the concept of group self government implies that the individual members control their behavior for the achievement of group goals.¹ As far as the effect that the worker has upon the development of self-government is concerned, Trecker states:

Group controls develop, it has been found, if groups are helped by their workers to make their own code of conduct and when they are encouraged to establish their own conditions of satisfactory behavior.²

Coyle states that the role of the worker differs widely according to the "type of group he is working with, its age and capacity for self-government, the mores of its particular community regarding authority, the personal drives and needs of individual members."³ Klein supports this by saying that the level of control which the group has over its own destiny and the amount of influence the worker applies depend upon the ability of the group to run itself.⁴

Several other authorities, such as Kurt Lewin, George Homans, and Ronald Lippitt,⁵ in the fields of sociology, social psychology, and group dynamics have devoted a considerable amount of effort to discussions of the importance of self-government to groups. Since this is one of the most significant phases of group life, it was felt by this writer that a study of the development of group self-government might be of some value to the development and

¹Harleigh B. Trecker, Social Group Work (New York, 1955), p. 192.

²Ibid., pp. 191-192.

³Grace L. Coyle, Group Work with American Youth (New York, 1948), p. 133.

⁴Alan F. Klein, Society - Democracy - and the Group (New York, 1953), p. 31.

⁵See works by these authors in the Bibliography.

improvement of the practice of social group work. Interest was evoked by reading the thesis of Lyndon A. Wade, a graduate of the Atlanta University School of Social Work, in which an effort was made to study the development of self-government in a club group by analyzing process records.¹ Because of relatively little research in social work on the dynamics of groups, it was hoped that a replication of the Wade study will be of some value in throwing light upon the process of the development of self-government in groups. As this study was a replication of the Wade study, the following definition of group self-government is given:

Self-government in groups, in this study is defined as the ability of the group as a whole to function with the following characteristics: (1) a degree of self-imposed group controls, (2) the ability to make majority decisions, (3) the ability to formulate plans, (4) the ability to follow through on the proposed plans and adhere to majority decisions, (5) the ability to evaluate the outcome of plans objectively, and (6) the provision of an atmosphere for equal participation of members.²

In Wade's study, forty (40) process records were used as sources of data. These records were written by a professional group worker and covered a period of one year of the group's life. In this study forty (40) process records have been used which were written by a beginning social group work student. These records were chosen starting with the beginning of the calendar year (the records written by students are more complete and accurate by this time since the beginning students have to go through a beginning learning process

¹Lyndon A. Wade, "The Study of Self-Government in a Club Group" (Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Social Work, Atlanta University, 1958).

²Ibid., p. 1.

about record writing between October and January). As these records have rather detailed narrative sections, they were useful for this study.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study were:

- (1) To trace the development of self-government in a children's club group.
- (2) To compare the findings of (1) with the findings of the Wade study.

Method of Procedure

(1) A schedule based on the six characteristics of group self-government (as it was defined earlier) was used. As this study was a replication of the Wade study, an identical schedule was used.¹

(2) One group was selected for study. A pilot study was first made analyzing the records of two groups and one group which had stability of membership and adequate records for this purpose was chosen.

(3) Forty (40) consecutive process records written by a first year student were studied. This student was part of a student unit assigned to concurrent field work at the Phyllis Wheatley Branch Young Women's Christian Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

(4) The schedule was used to trace the development of self-government in the process records.

(5) The findings within the frame of reference for the development of group self-government according to the definition given above were compiled, tabulated, interpreted, and compared with the findings of the Wade study.

¹Ibid., pp. 61-66; see also Appendix B of this study.

Scope and Limitations

This study has covered a span of forty (40) group meetings of a children's club group (pre-adolescents).

This study was further limited in that (1) the cultural and socio-economic status of the members comprising the group studied were not considered, (2) the record analysis dealt only with children who live in a particular section of Atlanta, Georgia, (3) the findings of this record analysis were derived from process records which were written by a beginning social group work student and were not intended for research purposes.

CHAPTER II

AGENCY SETTING

The agency which provided the setting for this study is the Phyllis Wheatley Branch Young Women's Christian Association, which is located in South West Atlanta, Georgia. The Branch had its beginning during and after the First World War when it was a recreation center for Negro soldiers who visited the Atlanta area.¹

The recreation center came to the attention of the Directors of the Central YWCA, who helped to open a Branch association known as the "Blue Triangle Center." Later the Branch was named the Phyllis Wheatley Branch. The Branch gained the support of the Community Chest which provided the major portion of the Branch's financial needs. In order to meet the increasing religious, social, and cultural needs of its membership, the Branch has, over the years, moved three times to larger facilities.² Its present location is 599 Tatnall Street, S. W., Atlanta, Georgia. Its clientele consists of annual members and an activity membership of clubs, classes, and interest groups.

Being one of a few social agencies for Negroes in a city whose metropolitan area population includes over 300,000 Negroes, and the only YWCA serving Negroes in Atlanta, the agency has the tremendous task of serving the entire Negro Community of the city as well as some of the outlying districts. One purpose of the Branch may be summed up as follows:

¹Ruby Myra Cohron, "A Study of Fifty Volunteers in the Phyllis Wheatley Branch Young Women's Christian Association, Atlanta, Georgia" (Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Social Work, Atlanta University, 1942), p. 5.

²Ibid., p. 6.

Members take part in developing the life of the Association through the democratic process of shared responsibility and co-operative effort. Through group experiences, opportunities are provided for members to grow and become responsible leaders and citizens.¹

In addition to the many services provided by the Branch, the agency also, cooperating with the Atlanta University School of Social Work, helps provide several groups that a unit of first year students studying social group work can work with while meeting the concurrent field work requirements of the School.

This student unit, which usually consists of from four (4) to seven (7) students, is accepted by the agency as part of its regular staff. Supervision for this unit is provided by a member of the faculty of the School of Social Work. The student unit is active each year from the first week in October through the last week in May.²

Most of the groups provided are children's play groups, but the members of the unit also assume some responsibility for working with teenage or adult groups. The children for the play groups are usually recruited from the two elementary schools located in the immediate neighborhood. As these children are recruited for the purpose of providing experience for the beginning students, they are not required to pay a membership fee (under ordinary circumstances children of the play group age range would not be served by the agency).

¹"Tips for Training Volunteers" (Atlanta, Georgia, Central YWCA, n.d.), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

²The 1956-57 academic year marked the beginning of the student unit. This writer was a member of the unit during the 1958-59 academic year.

The staff of the Phyllis Wheatley Branch Young Women's Christian Association is a body of professional workers, students, and volunteers in addition to office workers and others. Through supervision and staff meetings, the volunteers and staff are able to focus upon the needs of the clients, and work toward some suitable method of meeting these needs. There is a process of continuous planning in staff meetings in an effort to adjust program to meet the changing needs of the clientele and the community.

CHAPTER III

SURVEY OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

Before we can understand the dynamics involved in the development of group self-government, we must first define the concept "group," and look at some of the characteristics of a group and its members. This has been done in many ways by several different authorities, such as Thelen, Bonner, Sherif, and Elliott,¹ but the consensus of opinion seems to be stated by Thelen who lists the following as properties of groups:

1. The membership can be defined.
2. The members think of themselves as constituting a group.
3. There is a sense of shared purpose among members.
4. There is a feeling of greater ease of communication among members than between members and nonmembers.
5. One has a sense of approval or disapproval for himself and his actions, receiving feedback from others in the group.
6. One feels an obligation to respond to the behavior of others in the group.
7. A member has expectations for certain ways of behaving in the various situations in which the group finds itself.
8. There are leadership policies and roles.
9. There emerges a status system, a hierarchy of worth of individuals.²

Bonner adds to this that the face-to-face (psychological) group can exist only when there are two or more persons in relation to each other, and they must be interactive.³

There have been several experiments conducted concerned with the attractiveness of the group to its members. One was conducted by Festinger,

¹See works in the Bibliography by these authors.

²Herbert A. Thelen, The Dynamics of Groups at Work (Chicago, 1954), pp. 229-230.

³Hubert Bonner, Group Dynamics: Principles and Applications (New York, 1959), pp. 21-22.

Schachter, and Back.¹ In this experiment, the concept of the attractiveness of the group assumes a very important position because it leads to such major group phenomena as group standards and conformity behavior. They list the sources of group attractiveness or "valence" as being of two main types: "the direct, unmediated attractiveness of association with the group, this being largely composed of the valence of the group members for one another; and the attractiveness of the goals that are mediated by belonging to the group, e.g., activities made accessible to group members, or the prestige or status achieved through membership."²

Kelly and Thibaut maintain that:

The overall attractiveness of the group to all of its members is defined as the "cohesiveness" of the group. ...The cohesiveness of the group is postulated to set the upper limit on the power of the group to influence its members. In other words, the group cannot induce a force on its members greater than the strength of the members' motives to belong to the group. From this it follows that as the cohesiveness of the group increases, its "power" over its membership will likewise increase.³

The fact that this type of cohesion develops is discussed at length by the authors mentioned above. In order for any group to be effective, that is, move toward and attain its goal, it must have and develop some method of controlling the behavior and coordinating the efforts of its members.

Thelen sums this up by saying:

¹See L. Festinger, S. Schachter, and K. Back, Social Pressures in Informal Groups (New York, 1950).

²Harold H. Kelly and John W. Thibaut, "Experimental Studies of Group Problem Solving and Process." Gardner Lindzey, ed., Handbook of Social Psychology (Cambridge, 1954), II, p. 765.

³Ibid., p. 765.

As a group works, it develops its own way of life, its own culture. This culture is a set of agreements by means of which the group as a whole appears to coordinate the efforts and contributions of the individuals. When the agreements are appropriate to the task, the group is effective.¹

This "set of agreements" implies that group standards or norms of behavior must develop within the group before controls develop. As Klein points out, "Members interacting in a group develop sentiments: feelings about one another, about the work they are doing, about many other things. Implicit in such sentiments is a ranking in terms of preference: one end being preferred to another, this means to that, this person to the next."²

In defining the concept "norms," Homans states that: "A norm...is an idea in the minds of the members of the group, an idea...specifying what the members or other men should do or ought to do, are expected to do, under given circumstances."³

Klein goes on to say that norms are acquired through the interaction of persons and they are learned. She states:

The norms which govern the individual's behavior are inevitably group related: the individual has learned to perceive his situation in terms of previous experiences which seem to him to have elements significantly similar to his present position. The more easily he perceives this similarity, the more relevant certain norms appear and therefore the greater the pressure upon him to behave in accordance with them. The recognition of similarity gives the situation its meaning for him and removes uncertainty. The remoter the similarity, the more difficult it is for the individual to recognize the specific norms with which his behavior should accord.⁴

¹Herbert A. Thelen, op. cit., p. 274

²Josephine Klein, The Study of Groups (London, 1956), p. 76.

³George C. Homans, The Human Group (New York, 1950), p. 123.

⁴Josephine Klein, op. cit., p. 78. See also Muzafer Sherif, The Psychology of Social Norms (New York, 1936).

Theoretical Frame of Reference .

Now that the stage has been set, we are ready to consider the theoretical background for this study as it may apply to the six characteristics being studied as given in the definition of group self-government. These are:

(1) a degree of self-imposed group controls, (2) the ability to make majority decisions, (3) the ability to formulate plans, (4) the ability to follow through on the proposed plans and adhere to majority decisions, (5) the ability to evaluate the outcome of plans objectively, and (6) the provision of an atmosphere for equal participation by all members.

(1) A Degree of self-imposed group controls.

We have discussed earlier the importance of group values, standards, or norms as a means of controlling the behavior of groups. When an individual becomes a member of a group, his membership is determined by his acceptance of the "reference frame" of the group. He does not behave as he pleases, but the dominant norms of the group give him a standardized interpretation of his own experiences, and as long as he is part of the group, he adheres to the meanings which its norms provide.¹ Bonner goes on to say that:

Persons in groups regulate or control their behavior through the norms which they have collectively established. A person's status in the group, his acceptance or rejection by other members, is largely dependent on his adherence to its code. "Self-regulation" is an important property of dynamic groups. Rewards for adherence to, and punishments for deviations from, the group norms maintain and perpetuate the group.²

¹Hubert Bonner, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

²Ibid., p. 51.

Bonner states further that "groups design or evolve explicit codes of expected behavior, and those who remain members behave in accordance with their dictates. ...These codes, or group norms, make for economy in inter-individual behavior, for they are explicit indicators of how a person is expected to act in relation to other persons in a group context."¹

(2) The ability to make majority decisions, (3) the ability to formulate plans, (6) the provision of an atmosphere for equal participation.

For the purpose of avoiding unnecessary repetition, these three characteristics will be discussed together. Even though these areas seem to be so closely related that one cannot exist without the other, this relationship is not always necessary. For example, a group can reach a majority decision when there is not an atmosphere conducive to equal participation, even though this is highly desirable. Some writers maintain that such an atmosphere is essential. As Mary Follett points out, all members of a body (group) have to interact and participate in order to reach its goal, just as the parts of a machine work together when properly related.² She also suggests that the degree of control will depend partly on how well the ideas of all the members can be united.³

An experiment described by Lewin discovered that the group atmosphere played an important part in determining whether the group was secure or

¹Ibid., p. 52.

²Henry C. Metcalf and L. Urwick, Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett (New York, n.d.), p. 212.

³Ibid., p. 202.

insecure, and set up to a great extent the goals and values of the participating persons.¹ In this experiment three kinds of atmospheres were set up: democratic, authoritarian, and laissez-faire. The experiment showed two points: (a) democratic groups are most effective, and (b) persons who participate in democratic groups develop co-operative and objective attitudes.²

Elliott states that the true aim of democracy is to secure the active participation of every individual up to the limit of his capacity in the conduct of all his social, vocational, and political affairs, and this must be learned.³ He offers the concept of "group thinking" as a possible method for securing democratic participation. About decision-making he states:

If a decision is really to be a group decision, a method is necessary by which the group can make up its mind as a group. Those who share in carrying out a decision must have an opportunity to share in planning what is to be done. If the action is to satisfy the members of the group and if they are to live and work together harmoniously, the decision must represent results to which all are adjusted and in which all may participate. In the process of group thinking, individual members contribute to the results, and in turn their own ideas and desires are moulded by the group, so that corporate action is possible. Group thinking is the process by which the group may decide and plan as a group. It is therefore essential to effective corporate action.⁴

Surely an atmosphere of acceptance is necessary in a "group work group" before it can be led toward social work goals. As Trecker states:

¹George B. de Huszar, Practical Applications of Democracy (New York, 1945), pp. 117-118.

²Ibid., pp. 117-120. The findings of Lewin are not conclusive as they have been challenged by O. H. Mowrer.

³Harrison Elliott, The Process of Group Thinking (New York, 1928), p. 7.

⁴Ibid., pp. 7-8.

...the social group worker strives to establish a climate of acceptance and relaxation in small groups governed by democratic processes, the structure and composition of which will allow the participants maximum opportunity for emotional growth in accord with their needs and capabilities, and will provide for each member satisfying and meaningful social relationships.¹

- (4) The ability to follow through on proposed plans and adhere to majority decisions.

As the social group work writers have stated, it is only when the group members have a voice in the planning of group activities that they involve themselves in carrying out decisions and moving toward goals.² This opinion is supported by the findings of an experiment conducted by M. Deutsch, in which he compared the work of a group in which the members cooperated with each other and had a voice in the decision-making process with a group in which the members were to compete for individual achievement in a group project in which all decisions had already been made. His findings showed that the cooperative group manifested the following characteristics:

- (1) Stronger individual motivation to complete the group task. Also, members reported stronger feelings of obligation toward one another.
- (2) Greater division of labor (and greater variability in volume of contribution) among the members. At the same time, they exhibited greater coordination of effort.
- (3) More effective intermember communication. More ideas were verbalized, members were more attentive to one another and more acceptant of and affected by each other's ideas.
- (4) More friendliness was expressed.....Members were also more satisfied with the group and its products.³

¹Harleigh B. Trecker, ed., Group Work in the Psychiatric Setting (New York, 1956), p. 56.

²Harleigh B. Trecker, Social Group Work (New York, 1955), p. 80.

³Gardner Lindzey, ed., op. cit., II, p. 754, also p. 809.

Some groups seem to be bewildered when they first experience democratic group life because of their lack of knowledge and of ability to make group decisions and follow through on proposed plans. In groups led by group workers it has been found that at one moment the group may act in a responsible manner and carry through their plans, and at another the group will be irresponsible and show no interest in plans they have made only a short time before. In such cases, the worker should sense the situation and provide the necessary equilibrium for the group when the members act in an irrational fashion.¹

(5) The ability to evaluate the outcome of plans objectively.

When a group reaches a goal, it is good that they evaluate the outcome of their plans so that they will be better prepared to pursue other goals. This should increase the effectiveness of the group, especially if they weigh their performance of the tasks involved and the roles played by the group members.

Before a group reaches its final goal, it makes plans which are designed to carry it closer to its desired goal. When these plans are carried out one step at a time, it is necessary for the group to evaluate and weigh their previous plans to ascertain that they are moving in the right direction and doing what is in the best interest of the group.²

As was pointed out earlier in this study, the decision-making process is vital in group work groups because it is through this medium that the group

¹Gertrude Wilson and Gladys Ryland, op. cit., p. 160.

²Ibid., pp. 67-73.

members learn to give and take. People congregate not only to react with each other, but also to accomplish something through "collective action."¹ To achieve collective action, members of the group must participate in the decision-making process, which will inevitably disclose the differing values and objectives of the members. Wilson and Ryland state that conflicts and their solutions become the central core of any activity of any group operating in any media of human interest. They quote Follett by saying that integration (the process by which the group-as-a-whole may arrive at a solution that not only satisfies each member but is better than any of the contending suggestions) represents the height of achievement in group life, because such action is the basis of democratic government.

¹Ibid., p. 52.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The data for this study were derived from the analysis of forty (40) process records that were written by a first-year student of social group work, who was providing the group work leadership for the pre-adolescent boys' group written up in the records.¹ The records were the only sources of data for this study.

As in the original study, the researcher used a categorized research schedule which contained six (6) major developmental areas, forty-eight (48) constructed characteristics under the major developmental areas, one hundred and forty four (144) items under the constructed characteristics, and a standing category for registering indeterminates, in extracting the data from the records.²

Tabulation

The tabulation procedure was as follows: Under each area of the schedule (areas are indicated by Roman numerals I through VI), items 1, 2, or 3 were checked according to which item applied to each characteristic (characteristics are indicated by letters A through L).

After applying the schedule to each of the forty (40) process records, the results were divided into four chronological quartile groups for tallying and computation. These were four groups of ten (10) records each, which,

¹This group consisted of sixteen boys, 8-11 years of age. The average (mean) number of boys attending the forty meetings was ten. This group was a playgroup in the Phyllis Wheatley Branch YWCA and the student a member of the Student Unit. See Chapter II for agency setting.

²A copy of the schedule is contained in Appendix B.

summed up, equalled forty (40), the number of records used in the study. This was the identical procedure as that used in the original study.

In this presentation the data will be presented in two ways. The first column under each quartile will represent the total number of times each item appeared in the records. The second column will represent the total of items 1 plus 2 and item 3 for each quartile. The indeterminate item has been excluded from the second column because it was felt that nothing was to be proved, positively or negatively, if an item was not observable in the record (in the original study the term "indeterminate" was defined as meaning not observable¹). As items 1 and 2 are both positive, or as in some cases negative, it was felt that a clearer picture would be presented if these two items were combined and compared with item 3, which is mostly negative, to show the ratio of the incidence of positive to negative. The total number of times each item appeared, including indeterminate, is shown under column X. The totals of items 1 plus 2 and item 3 are shown under column Y. Columns X and Y are separated by a broken line. The quartiles are separated by a solid line.

As in the original study, the following modifications in the schedule items were used in the application of the schedule to individual group meetings:

1. Frequently Yes
2. Sometimes Partly
3. Never No

Findings

The findings are presented in tabular form as follows, in the same order that the characteristics and items appear in the schedule.

¹Lyndon A. Wade, op. cit., p. 34.

TABLE 1
MAKING MAJORITY DECISIONS

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
A. Majority of the Group Members are active in the Decision Making Process.								
1. All members participated ¹	5		4		2		1	
2. Over half of the members participated	4	9	5	9	5	7	3	4
3. No members participated	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	0		0		0		0	
B. Plans are modified at the Will of Majority.								
1. Frequently	3		2		2		1	
2. Sometimes	1	4	2	4	0	2	3	4
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	6		6		8		6	
C. Group Members maintain the Right to Discuss and Approve all Issues								
1. Right is unchallenged	4		4		3		2	
2. Right is sometimes Challenged	0	4	2	6	0	3	0	2
3. Right is challenged on all occasions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	6		4		7		8	

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
D. Group Members are indifferent to Problems Before the Group.								
1. Complete Apathy	1		0		2		1	
2. Half of the group is apathetic	2	4	2	2	4	6	0	1
3. Complete Lack of Apathy	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
4. Indeterminate	4		5		2		7	

Column X shows the total number of times each item, including indeterminate appeared. Column Y shows the totals of items 1 plus 2 and item 3.

¹Participation was identified as oral communication, expression of opinion, showing agreement (e.g. by voting) or through non-verbal activity.

Narrative Summary of Computations for Table 1

I. Making Majority Decisions.

- A. There was a gradual decline in member participation as the group developed.¹
- B. Plans were usually modified at the will of the majority.
- C. A permissive atmosphere of speech usually prevailed within the group.
- D. There was a lack of apathy when the group was faced with a problem.

¹This narrative summary of the computations is designed to show which characteristics registered on the schedule and how the weight of those that did register was distributed. For an interpretation of the data presented in this chapter, see chapter IV.

TABLE 2
FORMULATION OF PLANS

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
A. Every member has an Equal Opportunity to Participate in the Formulation of Plans.								
1. Decision making status is evenly distributed	5		2		1		0	
2. Decision making status fluctuates between even and uneven distribution	1	6	2	4	1	2	0	0
3. Decision making status is unevenly distributed	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	2		5		8		10	
B. There is General Participation in Planning.								
1. Frequently	3		2		3		1	
2. Sometimes	5	8	6	8	5	8	4	5
3. Never	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	1		1		2		5	
C. Sub-Group Domination is Evident in the Making of Plans.								
1. Frequently	1		1		0		0	
2. Sometimes	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	8		9		10		10	

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
D. Sub-Group Manipulation is Evident in the Making of Plans.								
1. Frequently	0		1		1		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		9		8		9	
E. Individual Domination is Evident in the Making of Plans.								
1. Frequently	3		0		0		1	
2. Sometimes	3	6	1	1	1	1	2	3
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	4		9		9		7	
F. Individual Manipulation is Evident in the Making of Plans.								
1. Frequently	2		2		1		1	
2. Sometimes	2	4	1	3	1	2	1	2
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	6		7		8		8	
G. The Group Shows Skill and Ability in Planning and Decision Making.								
1. Complete maturity of skill and ability	2		2		1		1	
2. Fluctuation of maturity according to time and area of activity	3	5	4	6	2	3	0	1
3. Complete immaturity of skill and ability	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4. Indeterminate	4		3		6	*	8	

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
H. The Group Plans Ahead Adequately for their Age Level.								
1. Frequently.	3		2		1		1	
2. Sometimes	3	6	3	5	2	3	2	3
3. Never	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	1
4. Indeterminate	3		5		5		6	

For explanation of Columns X and Y, see Table 1.

Narrative Summary of Computations for Table 2

II. Formulation of Plans.

- A. There was a sharp decline in the right of each member to participate in the formulation of plans.
- B. There was general member participation in planning.
- C. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- D. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- E. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- F. There was some individual manipulation in the making of plans.
- G. The group did show the ability and skill to make decisions according to the area of activity.
- H. The group usually planned ahead adequately for their age level.

TABLE 3
EQUAL PARTICIPATION (ATMOSPHERE)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
A. There is Acceptance of Each Group Member.								
1. Complete member acceptance	6		2		3		2	
2. Acceptance within sub-group Only	0	6	1	3	1	4	0	2
3. General Member Rejection	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	4		7		6		8	
B. There is an Emotional Tone of Warmth and Friendliness in the Group.								
1. Frequently	8		4		3		1	
2. Sometimes	0	8	0	4	2	5	1	2
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	2		6		5		8	
C. The Group Members Feel Free to Express Themselves Positively (Agreement).								
1. Frequently	5		2		3		1	
2. Sometimes	1	6	0	2	1	4	0	1
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	4		8		6		9	

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
D. The Group Members Feel Free to Express Themselves Negatively (Disagreement).								
1. Frequently	5		7		4		1	
2. Sometimes	0	5	0	7	2	6	0	1
3. Never	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	5		2		4		9	
E. The Group Members Have a Sense of Esprit de Corps or Group Loyalty.								
1. Consistently high level	4		4		4		1	
2. Considerable according to time and/or activity	3	7	2	6	3	7	2	3
3. Little if any	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	3		4		3		7	
F. Criticism by Group Members is Friendly.								
1. Frequently	1		0		0		1	
2. Sometimes	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	2
3. Never	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0
4. Indeterminate	9		8		7		8	
G. Criticism is Personal.								
1. Frequently	1		4		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	1	1	5	5	5	3	3
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	9		5		5		7	

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
H. There is Evidence of Positive Interpersonal Relationships Among the Members.								
1. Consistently high level	7		1		3		1	
2. Considerable according to time and/or activity	2	9	2	3	2	5	1	2
3. Little if any	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	1		7		5		8	
I. In Group Meetings Conflict is Possible Without Hard Feelings.								
1. Frequently	3		1		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	1
3. Never	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	7		8		9		9	

For explanation of Columns X and Y, see Table 1.

Narrative Summary of Computations for Table 3

III. Equal Participation (Atmosphere)

- A. Considerable member acceptance was in evidence.
- B. There was an emotional tone of warmth and friendliness on most occasions.
- C. There was a slight negative fluctuation in the members feeling free to express agreement.
- D. The group members felt free to disagree on occasions.
- E. The group members had considerable group loyalty that fluctuated slightly.
- F. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- G. There was some personal criticism.
- H. There was, at first, a high level of incidence of positive interpersonal relationships among the group members. There was a considerable decline along with an increase in the indeterminate.
- I. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.

TABLE 4
SELF IMPOSED GROUP CONTROLS

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
A. The Group Members Understand Agency Rules and Regulations.								
1. Almost Completely	2		1		0		0	
2. Adequately	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0
3. Very Inadequately	3	3	0	0	1	1	0	0
4. Indeterminate	5		8		9		10	
B. The Group Members Accept Agency Rules and Regulations.								
1. Almost Completely	1		1		0		0	
2. Adequately	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0
3. Very Inadequately	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	5		8		9		10	
C. The Group Controls its own Members in Informal Activities.								
1. Almost Completely	1		4		2		0	
2. Adequately	0	1	0	4	1	3	0	0
3. Very Inadequately	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	9		6		7		10	
D. The Group Controls its Own Members in Formal Activities.								
1. Almost Completely	0		2		0		0	
2. Adequately	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0
3. Very Inadequately	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		7		10		10	

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
E. The Group Penalizes its Members for Disruptive Behavior.								
1. Frequently	1		4		4		0	
2. Sometimes	0	1	1	5	1	5	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	9		5		5		10	
F. The Group Penalizes its Members or Sub-Groups for Undemocratic Behavior.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		9		10	
G. The Group Penalizes its Members or Sub-groups for dominating Behavior.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		10		10	
H. The Group Rewards its Members or Sub-Groups for Disruptive Behavior.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		10		10	

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
I. The Group Rewards its Members or Sub-Groups for Undemocratic Behavior.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		10		10	
J. The Group Rewards its Members or Sub-Groups for Dominating Behavior.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		10		10	
K. The Group Penalizes Those Members who do not Accept Assignments.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		9		10		10	
L. The Group Penalizes Those Members who Fail to Follow Through on Assignments.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		10		10	

For explanation of Columns X and Y, see Table 1.

Narrative Summary of Computations for Table 4

IV. Self Imposed Controls.

All of the characteristics under this developmental area registered indeterminate.

TABLE 5
EXECUTION OF PROPOSED PLANS

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
A. The Assignment of Roles is Realistic According to the Individual's Intellectual Understanding.								
1. Frequently	0		1		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		10		10	
B. The Assignment of Roles is Realistic According to the Individual's Ability to Perform.								
1. Frequently	2		2		2		0	
2. Sometimes	1	3	0	2	1	3	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	7		8		7		10	
C. The Assignment of Roles is Realistic According to the Individual's Recognition of Limitations.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		9		10	

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
D. The Group Members Generally Participate in the Assignment of Roles and Duties.								
1. Frequently	2		1		0		0	
2. Sometimes	1	3	2	3	3	3	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
4. Indeterminate	7		7		7		9	
E. The Group Members Responsibly Carry out their Assigned Roles and Duties.								
1. Frequently	3		5		3		0	
2. Sometimes	0	3	1	6	0	3	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	7		4		7		10	
F. There is an Organized Method of Checking up on Duty Assignments.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		10		10	
G. The Organization of Responsibility and the Division of Labor is of such a Nature as to Make Possible the Realistic Carrying out of Plans.								
1. Excellently	3		0		1		0	
2. Adequately	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0
3. Inadequately	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	6		10		9		10	

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
H. The Group Works Together in Carrying out Decisions Without Individual Resistance.								
1. Excellently	4		1		1		0	
2. Adequately	0	4	3	4	2	3	0	0
3. Inadequately	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	6		5		7		10	
I. The Group Works Together in Carrying out Decisions Without Sub-Group Resistance.								
1. Frequently	4		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	6		10		10		10	
J. The Work of the Group is Hampered by the Inexperience of the Members in Democratic Organization.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		10		10	

For explanation of Columns X and Y, see Table 1.

Narrative Summary of Computations for Table 5

V. Execution of Proposed Plans.

- A. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- B. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- C. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- D. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- E. The computations indicated that the group members did have some sense of responsibility in carrying out their assigned duties. Also, this characteristic registered indeterminate more than half of the time.
- F. This characteristic completely registered indeterminate.
- G. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- H. The computations showed that the group frequently worked together without individual resistance. This characteristic registered indeterminate more than half of the time.
- I. This characteristic largely registered indeterminate.
- J. This characteristic completely registered indeterminate.

TABLE 6
EVALUATION

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
A. The Group Blames Others for Failure.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		1	
2. Sometimes	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	9		10		10		9	
B. The Group Evaluates its Experiences.								
1. Frequently	2		1		2		0	
2. Sometimes	0	2	1	2	2	4	1	1
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	8		10		8		10	
C. The Group Profits from the Evaluation of its Experiences.								
1. Frequently	2		0		1		0	
2. Sometimes	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	8		10		8		10	
D. The Group Evaluates its Work Critically.								
1. Frequently	0		0		0		0	
2. Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	10		10		10		10	

TABLE 6 (Continued)

Characteristics and Items	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
E. The Group has the Capacity to Accept Responsibility and to Change.								
1. Frequently	2		4		2		0	
2. Sometimes	1	3	1	5	3	5	1	1
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Indeterminate	7		5		5		9	

For explanation of Columns X and Y, see Table 1.

Narrative Summary of Computations for Table 6

VI. Evaluation.

Characteristics A through D registered indeterminate.

- E. This characteristic registered indeterminate most of the time and was overt only a few times.

Interpretation

After this replication of the study, "The Development of Self-Government in a Club Group," got underway, several difficulties arose regarding the interpretation of data. This was due to several reasons, the most noticeable being the lack of sufficient detail in the studied process records. This caused several of the characteristics to register, largely, and in some cases completely indeterminate. Therefore the data that were obtained could not show overall progression in the development of group self-government in the records analyzed. The data did indicate growth in some areas but did not give a clear and total picture of the group's development. The same problem was encountered in the original study.¹

Perhaps a more precise picture would have been obtained if the study had begun with the first meeting of the group. It is possible that the records might have shown the interacting of the members more clearly around the time that the group was developing its norms of behavior and goals. The original study contains no information as to where the group studied was in its development when the study was begun.

The research schedule covered most of the major developmental areas of the development of group self-government. However, when this writer began to establish a frame of reference for this study, it was discovered that a very important developmental area was conspicuously missing, - i.e., the development of group standards of behavior or norms. The formulation of goals was also missing from the schedule. The exclusion of these areas

¹Lyndon A. Wade, op. cit., p. 40.

might have been intentional as the definition of the concept "group" implies that people gather into groups to reach certain goals and norms of behavior develop as this aggregation of persons becomes a group. As the definition of group implies that norms and goals are necessary before the group can function, there might be some justification in the writer of the original study excluding these developmental areas from the schedule.

Another limitation in the schedule was that only detailed records would register all of the items. Perhaps adequate consideration was not given to the fact that records are written according to agency and/or supervisory specifications, and do not provide adequate material for research. Perhaps adequate consideration was not given to the fact that one particular one phase of group life - in this case, group self-government - is not emphasized as the records are to show the overall development of the group.

Comparison with Wade Study

In interpreting the data derived while making this replication, the findings will be compared with those of the original study. After the findings for each developmental area are compared, some interpretation and analysis will be given. This will be done, as far as possible, in keeping with the frame of reference already established.

The findings of the two studies (the original and the replication) for each characteristic will be listed as follows. The characteristics will be listed as showing (1) progression, (2) retrogression, (3) largely indeterminate (largely indeterminate is defined as having registered very little, or three times or less for each half) or completely indeterminate, (4) indeterminate showing some progression, and (5) indeterminate showing some retrogression.

The results of the original study will be listed on the left and those of the replication on the right.

I. Making Majority Decisions.

- A. Majority of the group members are active in the decision-making process.
- B. Plans are modified at the will of the majority.
- C. Group members maintain the right to discuss and approve all issues.
- D. Group members are indifferent to problems before the group.

<u>Original Study</u>	<u>Replication</u>
A. Retrogression	A. Retrogression
B. Retrogression	B. Retrogression
C. Progression	C. Retrogression
D. Progression	D. Retrogression

II. Formulation of Plans.

- A. Every member has an equal opportunity to participate in the formulation of plans.
- B. There is general participation in planning.
- C. Sub-group domination is evident in the making of plans.
- D. Sub-group manipulation is evident in the making of plans.
- E. Individual domination is evident in the making of plans.
- F. Individual manipulation is evident in the making of plans.
- G. The group shows skill and ability in planning and decision-making.
- H. The group plans ahead adequately for their age level.

<u>Original Study</u>	<u>Replication</u>
A. Indeterminate (largely)	A. Retrogression
B. Progression	B. Progression
C. Indeterminate (largely)	C. Indeterminate (largely)
D. Indeterminate (largely)	D. Indeterminate (largely)
E. Indeterminate (largely)	E. Progression
F. Indeterminate (largely)	F. Progression
G. Progression	G. Retrogression
H. Progression	H. Retrogression

III. Equal Participation (Atmosphere).

- A. There is acceptance of each group member.
- B. There is an emotional tone of warmth and friendliness in the group.
- C. The group members feel free to express themselves positively (agreement).
- D. The group members feel free to express themselves negatively (disagreement).
- E. The group members have a sense of esprit de corps or group loyalty.
- F. Criticism by group members is friendly.
- G. Criticism is personal.
- H. There is evidence of positive interpersonal relationships among the members.
- I. In the group meetings conflict is possible without hard feelings.

<u>Original Study</u>	<u>Replication</u>
A. Progression	A. Indeterminate (largely)
B. Progression	B. Indeterminate (largely)
C. Progression	C. Indeterminate (largely)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| D. Indeterminate (progression) | D. Indeterminate (retrogression) |
| E. Retrogression | E. Retrogression |
| F. Indeterminate (largely) | F. Indeterminate (largely) |
| G. Indeterminate (largely) | G. Retrogression |
| H. Progression | H. Retrogression |
| I. Indeterminate (largely) | I. Indeterminate (largely) |

IV. Self-imposed Group Controls.

Original Study

All of the characteristics under this developmental area registered indeterminate.¹

Replication

All of the characteristics under this developmental area registered indeterminate.¹

V. Execution of Proposed Plans.

Characteristics A through D registered indeterminate for both studies.¹

- E. The group members responsibly carry out their assigned roles and duties.
- F. There is an organized method of checking up on duty assignments.
- G. The organization of responsibility and the division of labor is of such a nature as to make possible the realistic carrying out of plans.
- H. The group works together in carrying out decisions without individual resistance.
- I. The group works together in carrying out decisions without sub-group resistance.
- J. The work of the group is hampered by the inexperience of the members in democratic organization.

¹For a listing of these characteristics see the Schedule in Appendix B.

<u>Original Study</u>	<u>Replication</u>
E. Retrogression	E. Retrogression
F. Indeterminate (completely)	F. Indeterminate (completely)
G. Progression	G. Indeterminate (largely)
H. Indeterminate (progression)	H. Indeterminate (largely)
I. Indeterminate (progression)	I. Indeterminate (largely)
J. Indeterminate (retrogression)	J. Indeterminate (completely)

VI. Evaluation

Characteristics A through D registered indeterminate for both studies.

- E. The group has the capacity to accept responsibility and to change.

<u>Original Study</u>	<u>Replication</u>
E. Retrogression	E. Retrogression

In making more detailed comparisons between the original study and the replication and in discussing the developmental areas, only those characteristics which registered other than indeterminate will be considered.

I. Making Majority Decisions.

In this area, the findings indicated that the group studied for the replication experienced total retrogression in their ability to make majority decisions. The group studied for the original study showed some retrogression and an equal amount of progression. Most noticeable was that the original study group retrogressed in its ability to maintain majority participation in the making and modifying of plans. However, the group members did reserve the right to discuss all issues and they showed general concern over the problems with which their group was faced. The replication study group seemed to

have been loosely organized and inexperienced in making majority decisions. Also, they did not show too much concern over the problems which confronted them. Possible reasons for this difference between the groups will be discussed later.

II. Formulation of Plans.

Most of the characteristics under this developmental area were unobservable in the records studied for the original study. However, it was shown that the group progressed in its skill and ability in planning and decision-making and its ability to plan ahead adequately. Also the findings showed that there was an increase in the amount of member participation in planning. It is interesting to note here that the findings showed progression in the group's ability to make decisions and formulate plans, while in area I. the group retrogressed in its ability to make majority decisions and to modify plans at the will of the majority.¹

The records studied in making the replication indicated retrogression in the group's ability to make plans and to make decisions. Also there was a decline in the right of each member to have an equal voice in the making of plans. This is understandable as the findings also indicated that there was an increase in the amount of individual domination and manipulation in the making of plans and decisions.

In comparing the two groups, perhaps the reason that the replication group scored heavier than the original group is due to the greater amount of detail found in the records studied in making the replication.

¹This may indicate sub-group domination or some degree of individual domination.

III. Equal Participation (Atmosphere).

In the original study group the findings indicated that there was acceptance of each group member, there was an emotional tone of warmth and friendliness, the group members felt free to express agreement, and there were positive interpersonal relationships among the group members. There was also some indication that the group members felt free to express disagreement. There was only one observable area of retrogression, that being in the amount of group loyalty or esprit de corps shown by the group members.

In the replication study group there was some evidence that there was acceptance of each group member, that there was a warm and friendly emotional tone, and that the group members felt free to express agreement. There was some retrogression in the group members' feeling free to express disagreement. There was a decrease in the amount of group loyalty shown in the records. Also there was a decline in the amount of personal criticism and in the evidence of positive interpersonal relationships among the group members.

Even though the replication study group showed more retrogression than the original study group, it does not necessarily mean that the replication study group developed less in this area than the original study group. Again it might be interpreted as a result of the records being more detailed at first, and then becoming shorter, which caused those areas that were once slightly observable to become indeterminate, showing a superficial degree of retrogression.

IV. Self-imposed Group Controls.

All of the characteristics coming under this developmental area for both groups were indeterminate.

V. Execution of Proposed Plans.

Most of the characteristics under this developmental area registered indeterminate for the original study group. However, there was a decline in the group members' ability to responsibly carry out their assigned roles and duties. At the same time the organization of responsibility and the division of labor made possible the realistic carrying out of group plans.

In the replication study group all of the characteristics registered indeterminate except for one case of retrogression. The group members retrogressed in their ability to responsibly carry out their assigned roles and duties.

VI. Evaluation.

The findings indicated that the original study group made a small amount of progress in its ability to evaluate its experiences. The replication study group showed identical results in this area. There was retrogression in the capacity of both groups to accept responsibility and to change.

It seems that even though the replication study records registered heavier on the schedule, the original study group made more progress in the overall development of group self-government. The fact that the original study group showed more concern over the problems with which they were faced might be due to the difference in the levels of maturity of the members of the two groups. The original study group consisted of boys ranging from 15 through 18 years of age, while the replication study group consisted of boys ranging from 8 through 10 years. The members of the replication study group were dominated by the group's indigenous leaders, who made most of the group's decisions. This seems to be normal behavior for pre-adolescent boys. The members of

the original study group seemed to be much more experienced in democratic processes, so they showed more progress in the areas of making plans, etc. They were also more stable in moving toward their goal.

Even though there was a high incidence of characteristics registering indeterminate for both groups, this does not mean that there was a lack of development. It might simply mean that this factor was omitted from the process record as either being unimportant to the overall development of the group or being unnecessary detail in the records.

If we are to consider the frame of reference given earlier, we see that if there had not been any development in these areas there would have been no groups. For example, Area IV., "Self-imposed Group Controls," registered almost totally indeterminate for both groups studied. From the frame of reference we see that there had to be group standards or norms of behavior before the group could function, and that these are a means of group self-control. The ability of the groups to evaluate their experiences also registered indeterminate. But as seen earlier, as the group moves toward its goal it is constantly evaluating and re-evaluating its experiences.

It is almost inconceivable that the groups existed for a period of a year and had stability of membership without developing more self-government than shown in the findings of these two studies. This is especially true of "group work" groups. Therefore it is concluded that it may be that the records studied were inadequately detailed for study.

As stated earlier, the records analyzed in making the replication were a limiting factor in that they were not designed to be used for research purposes. Even though the records were, for the most part, adequately detailed

in the beginning, they became less detailed as the group and its group worker developed. (It may be inferred that the student shortened the detail in his records as he progressed in order to become accustomed to writing shorter or perhaps more precise records). This might account for the fact that several of the characteristics registered during the first half of the study but were largely indeterminate during the second half.

Some of the specific limitations presented by the records used in making the replication were as follows:

1. The lack of recorded member interaction around the formulation of plans, decision-making, execution of plans, evaluation of plans and experiences, equal participation, and development of self-imposed group controls was very noticeable.
2. In writing the records, the worker used such terms as "the boys," "they," "the group," "several," "it was decided," etc. This was usually done without giving the names or number of participants. Group discussions were not detailed so there was no way of determining the type of atmosphere which prevailed.
3. Sub-groupings were not clearly shown in the records. Neither were indigenous leaders described or their effect upon the functioning of the group. From the records it was difficult to determine whether the group recognized the values and limitations of democratic procedure.

The major limitation regarding records was the fact that they were not at all intended for research purposes. As it stands now, it seems improbable that any records which this writer might have been able to obtain would have been adequate for the purpose of tracing the development of group self-government. It seems that group process records are kept for various purposes which are usually spelled out by the agency or the supervisor. It seems that the one thing that records are not kept for is research. As Trecker points out, "Process records are written by the group worker primarily for himself and

for his own use continuously throughout his relationship with the group."¹ If this is the case, then it is implied that some records might be written in such a manner as to be meaningless to anyone except the writer and his immediate supervisor.

This leads to the conclusion that in order for records to be used for research purposes, there must be established a standardized method of doing group work recording that would be of use to others than the worker and his supervisor.²

Conclusion

It seems that the group analyzed in this study developed very little self-government as it was an activity-centered group and depended upon the worker to make plans, teach new games, etc. Also, this group consisted of pre-adolescent boys in which some decisions were made by the indigenous leaders rather than by the group. There was evidence that this type of indigenous leadership varied from one activity to another. For example, a boy who had low status within the group when the activity was ping-pong would have high status and be the decision-maker when the activity was football.

The group analyzed in the original study was also activity-oriented,³ and the same situation existed as described above with the replication study

¹Harleigh B. Trecker, Social Group Work (New York, 1948), p. 199.

²As it seems improbable that a standardized method of recording will be established in the near future, it might be wise to consider the possibility of devising new methods of observing the behavior of groups, or using some of the methods which are currently being employed by the group dynamicists and other small group researchers. As it seems that much research is necessary for futhering the development of the field of social group work, it would expedite matters if the latter method is used rather than the former because of the time it would take (and research itself, for that matter) to devise some standardized method of recording.

³Lyndon A. Wade, op. cit., p. 43.

group. As both groups seemed to have had enriching activity-centered programs, it is doubtful that emphasis was placed on the development of self-government by the group members or their workers.

As stated earlier in the theoretical frame of reference, group controls or self-government is one of the necessary properties of any group, and it seems unlikely that a group would develop in some other areas and not show development in this area. Therefore the conclusion is drawn that the records analyzed in both studies were inadequately detailed and did not give a total picture of the groups' development.

Wade, in the concluding section of the original study, said that:

Perhaps, one of the most important findings in this study might be the need for some standardized method of doing group work recording that could be of value other than to group leaders and their immediate supervisors.¹

The results of the replication support this statement. As indicated earlier, a more systematized conceptualization of social group work, group process, and group work method than now exists has to be developed before there is improvement in group work recording to the extent that records can be used in research.

¹Ibid., p. 44. The Wade study also contains the following footnote:
Hurwitz states that one way a "sound conceptual framework" could help improve group work would be by contributing to a "more highly focused practice," in a number of ways, including: "...specifying what should be observed and recorded subsequently, thus lending more structure to the group worker's task and providing the data required to evaluate group work services." Jacob T. Hurwitz, "Systematizing Social Group Work Practice," Social Work, Vol. 1, No. 3 (July, 1956), p. 64.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

This study, "The Development of Self-Government in a Club Group" was a replication of a previous study of the same title. In this study, as in the original, the researcher utilized a categorized research schedule to analyze forty (40) process records covering one year of a group's life.

The schedule covered six of the developmental areas of group self-government. These were (1) the making of majority decisions, (2) the formulation of plans, (3) the provision of an atmosphere for equal participation, (4) self-imposed group controls, (5) the execution of proposed plans, and (6) the evaluation of the outcome of plans and experiences.

When applying the schedule to the records, it was found that several of the characteristics under each developmental area registered indeterminate (unobservable in the records), and for one area, all of the characteristics registered indeterminate. Therefore, in order to interpret the data, ratios showing the amount of positive development to negative development for each characteristic were included in the tabulation. This was done because it was felt that nothing was to be proved, positively or negatively, if an item was unobservable in the records.

Ratios were then drawn up for the data presented in the original study and these were compared with the findings of the replication. In this way, it was possible to give some interpretation to the data derived from both record analyses. The results of this showed that the groups manifested very little development in all of the developmental areas. In most cases, the

actual data showed retrogression as the process records (for both study groups) were more detailed at first and gradually decreased in the amount of narrative detail.

Before interpreting the data, a theoretical frame of reference was established showing the importance of self-government and each developmental area to group functioning. Here it was shown that groups develop controls when people come together to reach a certain goal; that is, without group controls, there would be no groups.

Since the studies showed very little development of self-government and since most of the characteristics registered indeterminate, the conclusion was drawn that the records studied were inadequate for research purposes. Also, the records were concerned with the overall development of the group and did not concentrate on one phase, which, in this case, was self-government.

It was also concluded that since group records are kept for many different purposes - none of which is research - they are not useful for research purposes. If records are to be used for research purposes, then a standardized method of keeping group records must be devised. The same conclusion was reached in the original study.

In doing this study, the researcher used the same method of procedure as that used in the original study except for the establishment of a theoretical frame of reference and forming ratios of positive development to negative development for each characteristic. This was not done in the original study. It was felt that this would be helpful in interpreting and comparing the data of both the original study and the replication.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

EXCERPTS

Excerpts from the records are presented here in order to show typical evidence upon the basis of which the items in the schedule were checked.

The presentation is given in the same order as the constructed characteristics and items appear in the schedule.

I. Making Majority Decisions:

A. Majority of the group members are active in the decision making process.

1. All members participate

Date: 1-3-58

Present: 9

The group, after a rather lengthy discussion finally decided it wanted to go on a hike at the next meeting.

2. Over half of the members participate.

Date: 2-7-58

Present: 10

Worker, speaking to the group, inquired if anyone had any new ideas as to what could be done at the next meeting. Garry screamed, "Let's play 'Babyface Nelson.'" Most of the boys - excluding David, Cornell, and Jerome - yelled their approval.

3. No members participate

Date: 2-21-58

Present: 11

He (worker) suggested that the boys wait until the next meeting to continue the game. There was much muttering, but the boys finally agreed to continue at the next meeting.

B. Plans were modified at the will of the majority.

1. Yes

Date: 1-7-58

Present: 9

Worker reminded the boys of their plans to go hiking. But after much discussion, they finally decided it was too cold to go hiking; instead, they asserted they wanted to stay inside the gym and play games.

2. Partly

Date: 3-6-58

Present: 10

Larry...stated that he wanted a scooter. Worker remarked that the group had voted to play basketball. ...but Larry emphatically insisted that he wasn't interested. Worker gave him permission to obtain a scooter. He was joined later by Melvin and William.

3. No.*

C. Group members maintain the right to discuss and approve all issues.

1. Right is unchallenged

Date: 2-7-58

Present: 12

Worker called the boys together and asked them if they would like to play with the scooters using a new way to sit on them. Garry quickly yelled, "Oh Mr. S., we don't wan'na play with them scooters." Jerome asserted, "What kind of new way you talking about, Mr. S.?"

2. Right is sometimes challenged

Date: 2-21-58

Present: 9

James ran up to the group. He caught David's arm, and asserted, "Dave let's stay inside and play." David said nothing but shook his head in a negative way. Horace shouted, "We ain't gon'a stay in this gym. We voted to go outside."

3. Right is challenged on all occasions.*

D. Group members are indifferent to problems before the group.

1. Complete apathy

Date: 1-15-58

Present: 8

Worker inquired if anyone had any new games in mind or if anyone wanted to play new games. Everyone began looking at everyone else; no one said anything.

2. Half the group is apathetic

Date: 2-20-58

Present: 9

*This pattern, which will be observed throughout this section, indicates that no excerpt was recorded because the item did not register on the schedule.

Worker yelled, "What are you boys doing at the meeting tomorrow?"
 ...James quietly went out the door. ...Larry replied that he
 didn't care what was done.

3. Complete lack of apathy

Date: 1-8-58

Present: 10

Garry yelled, "I declare Mr. S., you oughta let us play tackle,
 cause I swear we play tackle all the time at school. ...all of
 the fellows shouted together, "Mr. S. if you don't let us play
 tackle, we ain't coming next week."

II. Formulation of Plans:

A. Every member has an equal opportunity to participate in the formulation
 of plans.

1. Decision making status is evenly distributed

Date: 1-30-58

Present: 15

It was finally decided - after much arguing on the part of in-
 dividual members - that the Troopers should go on a hike.

2. Decision making status fluctuates between even and uneven distri-
 bution*

3. Decision making status is unevenly distributed*

B. There is general participation in planning.

1. Yes

Date: 2-20-58

Present: 9

Worker yelled, "What are you boys doing at the meeting tomorrow?"
 There were many shouts and proposals as everyone tried to talk at
 once.

2. Partly

Date: 1-31-58

Present: 7

James asserted, "Mr. S. how come we don't go out to Mozley Park?
 We ain't been out there this year." Immediately there was a loud
 yell (of approval).

3. No*

C. Sub-group domination is evident in the making of plans.

1. Yes*
2. Partly*
3. No*

D. Sub-group manipulation was evident in the making of plans.

1. Yes*
2. Partly*
3. No*

E. Individual domination is evident in the making of group plans.

1. Yes

Date: 2-7-58

Present: 10

Worker, speaking to the group, inquired if anyone had any new ideas as to what could be done at the next meeting. Garry screamed, "Let's play 'Babyface Nelson'." Most of the other boys - excluding David, Cornell, and Jerome - yelled their approval.

2. Partly

Date: 1-14-58

Present: 10

Garry told the other boys to say that they wanted to play basketball. However, several of the other boys said that they wanted to play with the scooters instead.

3. No*

F. Individual manipulation is evident in the making of group plans.

1. Yes

Date: 1-8-58

Present: 10

Worker noticed Harold going around to each Trooper, whispering something in their ears. After he went back to his seat, all of the fellows shouted together, "Mr. S. if you don't let us play tackle, we ain't coming next week."

2. Partly*
3. No*

G. The group shows skill and ability in planning and decision making.

1. Complete maturity of skill and ability

Date: 1-3-58

Present: 9

The group, after a rather lengthy discussion, finally decided to go on a hike at the next meeting. Harold stated he would bring his football along; this met everyone's approval.

2. Fluctuation of maturity according to time and area of activity*

3. Complete immaturity of skill and ability

Date: 4-19-58

Present: 10

Worker asked the boys what they wanted to do after they finished playing the game. There was some yelling done by Cornell and David, but no one else said anything.

H. The group plans ahead adequately for their age level.

1. Yes

Date: 4-11-58

Present: 12

Worker asked the boys what they wanted to do at the next meeting. Garry and Harold said they wanted to play basketball if the weather was too bad to go outside. Several of the other boys yelled their approval. Harold said that they could take turns playing each other and that a game could be fifteen points.

2. Partly

Date: 2-14-58

Present: 9

Worker called the boys together and asked what they planned to do at the next meeting. Garry said, "I declare Mr. S. you always want somebody to tell you what they want to do." Harold asserted that it would be a good idea to play football if the weather permitted, and that he would bring his football. Worker said that it sounded like a good idea.

3. No

Date: 1-15-58

Present: 8

Worker inquired if anyone had any new games in mind or if anyone wanted to play new games. Everyone began looking at everyone else; no one said anything.

III. Equal Participation (Atmosphere).

A. There is acceptance of each group member.

1. Complete member acceptance

Date: 2-27-58

Present: 9

Most of the boys entered the gym together, talking and laughing among themselves.

2. Acceptance in sub-group only*

3. General member rejection*

B. There is an emotional tone of warmth and friendliness in the group.

1. Yes

Date: 2-14-58

Present: 9

Harold began playing "Baby-face Nelson" with Garry. Before long, the other boys had stopped playing with the scooters and had joined in.

2. Partly

Date: 1-15-58

Present: 8

Worker told Larry to join the other boys who were playing ball. When Larry went over, Harold yelled, "Aw, Mr. S., we don't wanna play with Larry."

3. No*

C. The group members feel free to express themselves positively (agreement).

1. Yes

Date: 1-31-58

Present: 7

Harold told James that he wanted to go to Mozley Park too.

2. Partly

Date: 2-7-58

Present: 10

Garry screamed, "Let's play 'Baby-face Nelson'." Most of the other boys - excluding David, Cornell, and Jerome yelled their approval.

3. No*

D. The group members feel free to express themselves negatively (dis-agreement).

1. Yes

Date: 2-6-58

Present: 9

Cornell asked worker if the visitor, Harry, could join the group. Horace yelled, "We don't need nobody else."

2. Partly*

3. No*

E. The group members have a sense of group loyalty or esprit de corp.

1. Consistently high level

Date: 2-13-58

Present: 13

Harold came in and told the worker that he had been in a fight with some other boys and that some of the Troopers helped him out.

2. Considerable according to time and/or activity*

3. Little if any*

F. Criticism by group members is friendly.

1. Yes*

2. Partly*

3. No*

G. Criticism is personal

1. Yes

Date: 1-23-58

Present: 11

Harold ran from the game and yelled, "Mr. S. don't let Larry play. He don't know how to do nothing right."

2. Partly*

3. No*

H. There is evidence of positive interpersonal relationships among the members

1. Constantly high level

Date: 2-27-58

Present: 9

After the boys had entered the gym they began to playfully wrestle with each other.

2. Considerably according to time and/or activity*

3. Little if any*

I. In the group meetings conflict is possible without hard feelings.

1. Yes

Date: 2-27-58

Present: 9

Harold said that he wanted to play basketball. James and Larry wanted to play with the scooters. ...after a short discussion ...some of the boys decided to play basketball while the others played with the scooters.

2. Partly*

3. No*

IV. Self-imposed group controls.

A. The group members understand agency rules and regulations.

1. Almost completely

Date: 1-30-58

Present: 15

Worker told the boys that they were not to go up on the second floor unless they had his permission. ...most of the boys nodded approval.

2. Adequately*

3. Very inadequately

Date: 1-23-58

Present: 11

Several of the boys were brought into the gyn by Mrs. B. who said that they had been running around on the second floor.

B. The group members accept agency rules and regulations

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

C. The group controls its own members in informal activities

1. Almost completely

Date: 2-6-58

Present: 9

Harold wanted to stop the game after fifteen points but the other boys insisted on twenty points. ...Harold finally agreed.

2. Adequately*

3. Very inadequately*

D. The group controls its own members in formal activities.

The items under this characteristic registered indeterminate.

E. The group penalizes its members or sub-groups for disruptive behavior.

The items under this characteristic registered indeterminate.

F. The group penalizes its members or sub-groups for undemocratic behavior.

The items under this characteristic registered indeterminate.

G. The group penalizes its members or sub-groups for dominating behavior.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

H. The group rewards its members or sub-groups for disruptive behavior.

The items under this characteristic registered indeterminate.

I. The group rewards its members or sub-groups for undemocratic behavior.

J. The group rewards its members or sub-groups for dominating behavior.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

K. The group penalizes those groups who do not accept assignments.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

L. The group penalizes those members who fail to follow through on assignments.

The items under this characteristic registered indeterminate.

V. Execution of Proposed Plans.

- A. The assignment of roles is realistic according to the individual's intellectual understanding.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

- B. The assignment of roles is realistic according to the individual's recognition of limitations.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

- C. The assignment of roles is realistic according to the individual's ability to perform.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

- D. The group members generally participate in the assignment of roles and duties.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

- E. The group members responsibly carry out their assigned roles and duties.

1. Yes

Date: 4-24-58

Present: 10

Harold brought the balls he had promised to bring. ...Garry was carrying a glove.

2. Partly*

3. No*

- F. There is an organized method of checking up on duty assignments.

This characteristic registered completely indeterminate.

- G. The organization of responsibility and the division of labor is of such a nature as to make possible the realistic carrying out of plans.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

- H. The group works together in carrying out decisions without individual resistance.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

- I. The group works together in carrying out decisions without sub-group resistance.
- J. The work of the group is hampered by the inexperience of the members in democratic organization.

The items under this characteristic registered indeterminate.

VI. Evaluation

- A. The group blames others for failure.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

- B. The group evaluates its experiences.

- 1. Yes

Date: 2-16-58

Present: 8

Harold and Garry were saying that they enjoyed the trip to worker's house and wanted to go again.

- 2. Partly*

- 3. No*

- C. The group profits from the evaluation of its experiences.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

- D. The group evaluates its work critically.

The items under this characteristic were indeterminate.

- E. The group has the capacity to accept responsibility and to change.

- 1. Yes

Date: 1-30-58

Present: 15

The boys began to say that they would not go up on the second floor again.

- 2. Partly*

- 3. No*

APPENDIX B

SCHEDULE

TRACING THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT IN CLUB GROUPS

INSTRUCTIONS: In the box on the right, place a check next to the number 1, 2, 3, that best indicates the degree of intensity of the listed characteristics, as found in the group record.

Note that the numbers indicating the intensity and presence of the listed characteristics move from the maximum developmental level of intensity of 1 to a minimum developmental level of intensity of 3, with a category for registering indeterminate.

The listed characteristics on the left are ideally conceived points of those which will be found throughout a group process record in variation of intensity and degree of development.

The meanings or definitions of the various levels of intensity are listed on the right of the paper.

I. Making majority decisions:	Definitions
A. Majority of the group members are active in the decision-making process.	1. <input type="checkbox"/> All members participate 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Over half participate 3. <input type="checkbox"/> No members participate 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate
B. Plans are modified at the will of the majority.	1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently modified 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes modified 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never modified 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate
C. Group members maintain the right to discuss and approve all issues.	1. <input type="checkbox"/> Right is unchallenged 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Right is sometimes challenged 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Right is challenged on all occasions 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate
D. Group members are indifferent to problems before the group.	1. <input type="checkbox"/> Complete apathy 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Half the group is apathetic 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Complete lack of apathy 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate

II. Formulation of Plans:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. Every member has an equal opportunity to participate in the formulation of plans. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Decision making status is evenly distributed
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Decision making status fluctuates
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Decision making status is unevenly distributed
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| B. There is general participation in planning. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| C. Sub-group domination is evident in the making of plans. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| D. Sub-group manipulation is evident in the making of plans. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| E. Individual domination is evident in the making of group plans. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| F. Individual manipulation is evident in the making of plans for a group. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| G. The group shows skill and ability in planning and decision making. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Complete maturity of skill and ability
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Fluctuation of maturity according to the time and area of activity
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Complete immaturity of skill and ability
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| H. The group plans ahead adequately for the age level. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |

III. Equal Participation (Atmosphere):

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. There is acceptance of each group member. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Complete member acceptance
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptance within sub-group only
3. <input type="checkbox"/> General member rejection
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| B. There is an emotional tone of warmth and friendliness in the group. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| C. The group members feel free to express themselves positively (agreement). | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| D. The group members feel free to express themselves negatively (disagreement). | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| E. The group members have a sense of esprit de corps or group loyalty. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently high level
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Considerable according to time and/or activity
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Little if any
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| F. Criticism by group members if friendly. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| G. Criticism is personal. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| H. There is evidence of positive interpersonal relationships among the members. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently high level
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Considerable according to time and/or activity
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Little if any
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |
| I. In the group meetings, conflict is possible without hard feelings. | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate |

IV. Self Imposed Group Controls:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The group members understand agency rules and regulations. | 1. <input type="text"/> Almost completely
2. <input type="text"/> Adequately
3. <input type="text"/> Very inadequately
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |
| B. The group members accept agency rules and regulations. | 1. <input type="text"/> Almost completely
2. <input type="text"/> Adequately
3. <input type="text"/> Very inadequately
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |
| C. The group controls its own members in informal activities. | 1. <input type="text"/> Almost completely
2. <input type="text"/> Adequately
3. <input type="text"/> Very inadequately
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |
| D. The group controls its own members in formal activities. | 1. <input type="text"/> Almost completely
2. <input type="text"/> Adequately
3. <input type="text"/> Very inadequately
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |
| E. The group penalizes its members or sub-groups for disruptive behavior. | 1. <input type="text"/> Frequently
2. <input type="text"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="text"/> Never
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |
| F. The group penalizes its members or sub-groups for undemocratic behavior. | 1. <input type="text"/> Frequently
2. <input type="text"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="text"/> Never
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |
| G. The group penalizes its members or sub-groups for dominating behavior. | 1. <input type="text"/> Frequently
2. <input type="text"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="text"/> Never
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |
| H. The group rewards its members or sub-groups for disruptive behavior. | 1. <input type="text"/> Frequently
2. <input type="text"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="text"/> Never
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |
| I. The group rewards its members or sub-groups for undemocratic behavior. | 1. <input type="text"/> Frequently
2. <input type="text"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="text"/> Never
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |
| J. The group rewards its members of sub-groups for dominating behavior. | 1. <input type="text"/> Frequently
2. <input type="text"/> Sometimes
3. <input type="text"/> Never
4. <input type="text"/> Indeterminate |

K. The group penalizes those members who do not accept assignments.

1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

L. The group penalizes those members who fail to follow through on assignments.

1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

V. Execution of Plans:

A. The assignment of roles is realistic according to the individual's intellectual understanding.

1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

B. The assignment of roles is realistic according to the individual's ability to perform.

1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

C. The assignment of roles is realistic according to the individual's recognition of limitations.

1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

D. The group members generally participate in the assignment of roles and duties.

1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

E. The group members responsibly carry out their assigned roles and duties.

1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

F. There is an organized method of checking up on duty assignments.

1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

G. The organization of responsibility and the division of labor is of such a nature as to make possible the realistic carrying out of plans.

1. ☐ Excellently (very well)
2. ☐ Adequately
3. ☐ Inadequately
4. ☐ Indeterminate

H. The group works together in carrying out decisions without individual resistance.

1. ☐ Excellently (very well)
2. ☐ Adequately
3. ☐ Inadequately
4. ☐ Indeterminate

- I. The group works together in carrying out decisions without sub-group resistance.
1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate
- J. The work of the group is hampered by the inexperience of the members in democratic organization.
1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

VI. Evaluation:

- A. The group blames others for failure.
1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate
- B. The group evaluates its experiences.
1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate
- C. The group profits from the evaluation of its experiences.
1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate
- D. The group evaluates its work critically.
1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate
- E. The group has the capacity to accept responsibility and to change.
1. ☐ Frequently
2. ☐ Sometimes
3. ☐ Never
4. ☐ Indeterminate

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bonner, Hubert. Group Dynamics: Principles and Applications. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1959.
- Bonner, Hubert. Social Psychology: An Interdisciplinary Approach. New York: American Book Company, 1953.
- Britt, Stewart H., ed. Selected Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1953.
- Campbell, Elsie H. Gauging Group Work. Detroit: Board of Education, 1938.
- Cartwright, Dorwin and Zander, Alvin. Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. White Plains: Row, Peterson and Company, 1953.
- Collins, Alice H. Methods in Group Work. New York: The Woman's Press, 1938.
- Coyle, Grace L. Group Experience and Democratic Values. New York: The Woman's Press, 1947.
- Coyle, Grace L. Studies in Group Behavior. New York: Association Press, 1937.
- Coyle, Grace L. Group Work with American Youth. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
- Coyle, Grace L. Social Process in Organized Groups. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1930.
- Elliott, Harrison S. The Process of Group Thinking. New York: Association Press, 1928.
- Festinger, L., Schachter, S. and Back, K. Social Pressures in Informal Groups. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Gouldner, Alvin W., ed. Studies in Leadership: Leadership and Democratic Action. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Haiman, Franklyn S. Group Leadership and Democratic Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.
- Hall, L. K. and Bass, Meyer. Group Work Horizons. New York: Association Press, 1944.
- Hare, A. Paul et al. Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1955.

- Hendry, Charles E. ed. A Decade of Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1948.
- Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950.
- Huszar, George B. de. Practical Applications of Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945.
- Klein, Alan F. Society - Democracy - and the Group. New York: The Woman's Press, 1953.
- Klein, Josephine. The Study of Groups. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956.
- Konopka, Gisela. Therapeutic Group Work with Children. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949.
- Kaiser, Clara A., ed. The Objectives of Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1936.
- Lewin, Kurt. Resolving Social Conflicts. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
- Lieberman, Joshua, ed. New Trends in Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1938.
- Lindzey, Gardner, ed. Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E. et al. Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1958.
- Metcalf, Henry C. and Urwick, L., ed. Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett. New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.
- Murphy, Marjorie. The Social Group Work Method in Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959.
- Murray, C. C. and Murray, J. P. Guide Lines for Group Leaders. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1954.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. Social Psychology. New York: The Dryden Press, 1950.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. et al. Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1947.
- Parsons, Talcott, and Bales, Robert F. Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

- Phillips, Helen U. Essentials of Social Group Work Skills. New York: Association Press, 1957.
- Sherif, Muzafer. The Psychology of Social Norms. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1936.
- Sherif, Muzafer, and Wilson, M. O. Group Relations at the Crossroads. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.
- Slavson, Samuel R. Creative Group Education. New York: Association Press, 1938.
- Sullivan, Doretha, ed. Readings in Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1952.
- Swanson, Guy E. et al. ed. Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952.
- Sweedlum, Verne S. and Crawford, Golda M. Man in Society. New York: American Book Company, 1956.
- Thelen, Herbert A. Dynamics of Groups at Work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Trecker, Harleigh B. Social Group Work: Principles and Practice. New York: Woman's Press, 1948; Revised Edition, 1955.
- Trecker, Harleigh B. ed. Group Work in the Psychiatric Setting. New York: Whiteside, Inc., 1956.
- The National Association for the Study of Group Work. Exploring Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1937.
- The National Education Association and the Research Center for Group Dynamics, M. I. T. Group Growth and Educational Dynamics. Bulletin No. 2. Washington, D. C.: 1948.
- Williamson, Margaretta. The Social Worker in Group Work. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929.
- Wilson, Gertrude and Ryland, Gladys. Social Group Work Practice. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949.
- Wittenberg, Rudolph N. So You Want to Help People. New York: Association Press, 1947.
- Wittenberg, Rudolph N. The Art of Group Discipline. New York: Association Press, 1951.
- Young, Kimball. Source Book for Social Psychology. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1927.

Boyd, Neva L. "Social Group Work - A Definition with a Methodological Note," Bulletin I, Division of Social Work, Northwestern University, (April, 1937).

Brightbill, Charles K. "Group Work in Public Recreation," A Decade of Group Work, edited by Charles Hendry, New York: Association Press, 1948.

Coyle, Grace L. et al., "The Definition of the Function of the Group Worker," The Group, 11(May, 1949).

Coyle, Grace L. "Group Work in Recreation," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1947.

Fogel, David, "Democratic Group Self-Determination," The Group, 16(April, 1954).

Hendry, Charles E. "The Dynamics of Leadership," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1946.

Hendry, Charles E. "A Review of Group Work Affirmations," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1940.

Hurwitz, Jacob T. "Systematizing Social Group Work Practice," Social Work, Volume 1, No. 3 (July, 1956).

Johns, Ray E. "An Examination of Group Work Practices," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1940.

Kaiser, Clara A. "Current Frontiers in Social Group Work," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1947.

"The Dynamics of the Discussion Group," The Journal of Social Issues, IV(Spring, 1948).

Wilson, Gertrude, "Human Needs Pertinent to Group Work Services," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1942.

Bulletins

"Tips for Training Volunteers". Atlanta: Central YWCA, n.d. (Mimeographed).

Unpublished Material

Cohron, Ruby Myra. "A Study of Fifty Volunteers in the Phyllis Wheatley Young Women's Christian Association, Atlanta, Georgia." Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Social Work, Atlanta University, 1942.

Wade, Lyndon A. "The Study of Self-Government in a Club Group," Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Social Work, Atlanta University, 1958.